

REMARKS

Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner Kim Lovel and Primary Examiner Kuen Lu for the courtesies extended during the telephonic conference on April 19, 2007, with Francis Dunn. During the conference, there was discussion regarding overcoming the rejections of the subject claims, including discussion regarding overcoming the Section 101 rejection of claims 1, 20 and 25, wherein there was discussion regarding amending claims 1 and 25 to indicate that the respective interfaces are "embodied on a computer-readable storage medium" and amending claim 20 to indicate that the system includes a processor; the Examiner indicated that such amendments may overcome the Section 101 rejection. There was also discussion regarding the rejection of the subject claims under Section 103, as well as discussion regarding proposed amendments to claims 1 and 21, wherein the Examiner indicated that such proposed amendments may produce allowable subject matter, the proposed amendment to claim 1 relating to a component that can enlarge information and insert additional textual information in the area defined by the lens component, and the proposed amendment to claim 21 relating to animating the content within the lens region to enlarge the content to different sizes based on the type of content. Further, there was discussion of amending the dependent claims of claim 1 to clarify that the dependent claims are directed to an "interface," rather than a "system."

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-18, 20, 21, and 25 have been amended as shown on pages 3-8 of the Reply. In addition, the specification has been amended as indicated on page 2. No new matter has been added and amendments made herein will not require a new search.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Claim 25

Claim 25 is objected to on the ground that there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the associated parameters" in line 4 of the claim. Withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested in light of the amendment made herein to claim 25.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-20 and 25-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-20 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. The subject claims are directed to statutory subject matter in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

For example, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claim 25), as amended, recites: A computer-implemented interface for data presentation *embodied on a computer-readable storage medium*. Further, independent claim 20, as amended, recites: A computer-implemented system for displaying query results, comprising: *a processor*. As can be readily seen, each of the subject claims is comprised of hardware and/or an appropriate medium so as to be in accord with 35 U.S.C. § 101.

In view of at least the foregoing, the subject claims are properly directed to statutory subject matter. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-6, 10, 12 and 15-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-6, 10, 12 and 15-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar, *et al.* (US 6,768,497) in view of Kraft, *et al.* (US 2005/0086217). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Baar, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under § 103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *See* MPEP § 706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The claimed subject matter relates to automatic and dynamic presentation of search result information in accordance with an adjustable viewing lens that can balance the need to examine a plurality of search results while promoting, expanding, or highlighting information of interest within the lens. The claimed subject matter can include a lens component that can selectively animate, magnify, and present information within the area encompassed by the lens component (“lens area”) as compared to information outside the lens area. Further, additional content (e.g., textual information) associated with a search result can be inserted while the search result is within the lens area to display more content associated with the search result as compared to the amount of content displayed when the search result is outside the lens area. Thus, more detailed information can be selectively presented within the lens area while providing a balanced or minimized view of other results that may remain outside the lens area. In order to show more descriptive content as desired, additional page content can be progressively exposed based on mouse activity, such as a hover or click using the mouse, for example. By integrating a fisheye or other type lens with the insertion of additional content (e.g., textual information, thumbnails of the web page, information about size of result, download speed, recency of the page), the layout of a search result list can be dynamically adapted to user interaction.

In particular, independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 20 and 25), as amended, recites: *a layout component that displays a detailed subset of information, comprising textual information, within the area defined by the lens component based upon the search result, the detailed subset of information is animated to enlarge in size and to include additional textual information, as compared to information outside of the area defined by the lens component.* Baar, *et al.*, and Kraft, *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest this distinctive feature of the claimed subject matter.

Rather, Baar, *et al.* discloses a method for displaying visual information on a display screen of a computer. (See col. 2, lns. 23-25). Baar, *et al.* teaches electronic scaling of document content to a size that allows presentation of the full content on the display surface with lenses to enlarge regions of interest to make them readable to the user. (See col. 5, lns. 37-42). The lenses are pre-placed on important content components including headlines, feature articles, table of contents, and advertisements.

(See col. 5, lns. 44-47). The lens is shaped to suit the shape of the article or other area of interest. (See col. 5, lns. 47-51).

However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Baar, *et al.* fails to teach a detailed subset of information within a lens area that is enlarged in size and includes additional textual information associated with a search result, as compared to search results displayed outside of the lens area. Baar, *et al.* does disclose magnifying text in a lens area. (See col. 5, lns. 51-60). Baar, *et al.* also discloses displaying an image in low resolution and then retrieving additional data from a server when a pointing device hovers over a particular region of interest in order to display the image in high resolution. (See col. 8, ln. 58 – col. 9, ln. 2). Baar, *et al.* does not teach that a different amount of text for a search result is displayed within the lens area as compared to when the search result is outside the lens area.

Further, Kraft, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest the distinctive functionality of the claimed subject matter. Instead, Kraft, *et al.* teaches methods of summarizing a search result abstract on a client computer, locating indexable words within a search result abstract retrieved from a search engine, and dynamically generating differing levels of detail in a search result abstract on a user computer. (See p. 1, ¶¶ [0013]-[0015]). Kraft, *et al.* discloses a “zoom” function that can be engaged to examine a search result abstract. (See p. 1, ¶ [0013]). The “zoom” function can examine the search result abstract to identify indexable words (*e.g.*, key words) in a number of “search windows,” while disregarding “noise” words (*e.g.*, to, the), and the indexable words selected by the “zooming” process can then be displayed to the user, with the “noise” words filtered out. (See p. 3, ¶ [0028]; p. 4, ¶ [0040]).

However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Kraft, *et al.* fails to teach or suggest magnifying or enlarging the size of content associated with a search result within a lens area, or inserting additional text associated with the search result when within the lens area, as compared to search results displayed outside the lens area. Rather, Kraft, *et al.* teaches summarizing an abstract of a search result to display indexable words and remove “noise” words. (See, *e.g.*, p. 3, ¶¶ [0028]-[0029]; p. 4, ¶ [0040]). Thus, Kraft, *et al.* actually teaches to remove words from an abstract of a search result, as opposed to providing more information regarding a search result.

In contrast, the claimed subject matter can include a lens component that comprises a defined area (e.g., lens area) in an interface and can display information (e.g., search results), or a subset thereof. The information displayed within the lens area can be *animated to enlarge in size* as compared to information outside of the lens area, for example. Further, *additional textual information* associated with a search result can be inserted within the lens area, as compared to the amount of textual information that is displayed when the search result is outside the lens area, for example. Enlarging the size of the information and including additional textual information associated with a search result when the search result, or portion thereof, is within the lens area can allow a user to more easily review information associated with the search result while within the lens area, while providing a de-emphasized view of other information outside of the lens area. The de-emphasis of search results outside the lens area can allow more search results to be displayed in the interface in order to minimize the need for scrolling and other actions when multiple search results are obtained from a query, for example.

Further, claim 21, as amended, recites: *animating the content associated with the at least one of the search results displayed within the lens region to enlarge the size of the content as compared to content associated with the at least one other search result displayed outside the lens region, a first subset of the content associated with a first content type, and associated with the at least one of the search results, is enlarged to a first size and another subset of the content associated with another content type, and associated with the at least one of the search results, is enlarged to another size based on the respective content type*. Baar, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest this distinctive aspect of the claimed subject matter.

Rather, Baar, *et al.* teaches magnifying text within a lens in a uniform manner. (See, e.g., col. 2, lns. 26-34; see also Fig. 1 and Fig. 4). However, Baar, *et al.* fails to teach enlarging content within a lens to different sizes based on the type of content. Further, Kraft, *et al.* fails to teach magnifying or enlarging the size of content within a lens, let alone enlarging different types of content, based on the type of content, as Kraft, *et al.* teaches summarizing an abstract of a search result to display indexable words and remove “noise” words. (See, e.g., p. 3, ¶¶ [0028]-[0029]; p. 4, ¶ [0040]).

In contrast, the claimed subject matter can apply differing levels of magnification or enlarging of content to a search result displayed within the lens region based on the type of content (e.g., title, description of search result, uniform resource locator (URL)). For example, a search result within a lens region can be enlarged in size compared to search results that fall outside the lens region. Further, within the lens region, different types of content can be enlarged to different sizes based on the type of content. As further example, a search result may include a title, description, and URL, all displayed within the lens region. The title can be enlarged to a first size, the description can be enlarged to another size (e.g., larger than the size of the title for ease of reading), and the URL can be enlarged to yet a third size. Such ability to provide for non-uniform magnification within a lens area can further facilitate the review of search results.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Baar, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* fail to disclose each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in independent claim 1, 20, 21, and 25 (and associated dependent claims 2-5, 10, 12, 15-19, 22-24, 26, and 27). Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar, *et al.* (US 6,768,497) in view of Kraft, *et al.* (US 2005/0086217) and further in view of Wolton, *et al.* (US 2004/0030741). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Claim 13 depend from independent claim 1. Wolton, *et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of Baar, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Wolton, *et al.* relates to a tool for creating intelligent information management applications in the form of specialized search and retrieval agents. (*See* p. 3, ¶ [0048]). Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 7-9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar, *et al.* (US 6,768,497) in view of Kraft, *et al.* (US 2005/0086217), and further in view of Card, *et al.* (US 2002/0083101). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn

for at least the following reason. Baar, *et al.*, Kraft, *et al.*, and Card, *et al.* fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Claims 7-9 depend from independent claim 1. Card, *et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of Baar, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Card, *et al.* relates to systems and computer program products for improving the ability of users to interact with electronic documents. (See p. 2, ¶ [0016]). In view of at least the foregoing alone, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Further, claim 7 recites: *the lens component is defined as a fisheye lens that is applied vertically to a display at about a focal center of the display.* Baar, *et al.*, Kraft, *et al.*, and Card, *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest this distinctive feature of the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner concedes that Baar, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* do not disclose the claimed subject matter as recited in claim 7. (See Office Action, dated March 9, 2007, p. 14, ¶ 14). However, the Examiner contends that Card, *et al.* teaches “the lens component is defined as a fisheye lens that is applied vertically to a display at about a focal center of the display.” (*Id.*) Applicants’ representative respectfully submits that the Examiner’s contention that Card, *et al.* teaches the claimed subject matter is erroneous.

Rather, Card, *et al.* simply discloses utilizing a fisheye lens algorithm to calculate a degree of interest of a given object. (See p. 5, ¶¶ [0079]-[0080]). Card, *et al.* further discloses that the fisheye lens algorithm contains an intrinsic degree of interest function and a distance-based degree of interest function. (See p. 5, ¶ [0080]). However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Card, *et al.* fails to disclose a fisheye lens that is *applied vertically to a display at about a focal center of the display.*

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that Baar, *et al.*, Kraft, *et al.* and Card, *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter as recited in claim 7 (and claims 8 and 9 that depend therefrom). Accordingly, it is believed that the subject claims are in condition for allowance, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

VI. Rejection of Claims 11 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baar, *et al.* (US 6,768,497) in view of Kraft, *et al.* (US 2005/0086217) and further in view of Montague (US 2005/0168488). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Baar, *et al.*, Kraft, *et al.* and Montague, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each and every element of the claimed subject matter. Claims 11 and 14 depend from independent claim 1. Montague fails to cure the deficiencies of Baar, *et al.* and Kraft, *et al.* with respect to independent claim 1. Rather, Montague relates to methods of combining user interfaces, such as zooming in/out, panning, rotating, drawing, selecting, and manipulating during a drag by a mouse for a graphics display. (See p. 1, ¶ [0004]). In view of at least the foregoing alone, the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063[MSFTP607US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731